



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,885	12/26/2001	Tsunemi Tokuhara	2001_1887A	9250

513 7590 10/11/2005

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,885

Applicant(s)

TOKUHARA, TSUNEMI

Examiner

Jude J. Jean-Gilles

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 12/26/2001. Claimed priority is granted from foreign application No. 2000-400870, with a priority date of 12/28/2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, recites the phrase "*the same structure*" in line 2. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, recites the phrase "*such as*" in line 4. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, recites the phrase "*and the like*" in line 4-5. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, recites the phrase "*the exchange of the data*" in line 18. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2, recites the phrase "*such as*" in line 2. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2, recites the phrase "*and the like*" in lines 2-3. There is no antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The above noticed problems are just exemplary. Applicant is requested to thoroughly review the application and correct the same.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarui et al(Tarui), U.S. Patent No: 6510496 B1 in view of in Koenck et al (Koenck) U.S. Patent No. 6,714,983 B1.

Regarding **claim 5**, Tarui teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Tarui fully discloses in a coupled type computers of a type wherein the computers of the same structure are coupled to form an ensemble type computers (fig. 1, items 100-800),

wherein a holder is formed by a polyhedron cube, and computer components such as CPUs, memories and the like are built in the holder, and a cavity is provided in the inside of the holder to form a radio propagation bus space (fig. 1, items 190, 170, 170a; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30)and

a plurality of radio.electric signal interconversion elements provided with a signal identification means are disposed which face the radio propagation space, and each radio electric signal interconversion element is connected to the corresponding

Art Unit: 2143

computer components, and a plurality of radio lines for radio propagation communicating with the radio propagation bus space are provided on the holder and holes communicating with the radio lines open to the surface of the outside of the holder, and (column 12, lines 6-67; column 13, lines 1-59),

when the same structure holders approach, each of the radio propagation bus space of the adjacent holders are mutually communicated by means of the radio lines, and the exchange of the data is allowed to carry out between each computer components in the holder and the computer components in a plurality of the adjacent holders through the transmission and reception of the radio electric signal interconversion elements (column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30).

However Tarui does not specifically disclose the radio bus lines of the invention. In the same field of endeavor, Koenck teaches "...radio card that has corresponding plurality of lines for electrical signal connections...." [see Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67]

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Koenck's teachings focusing a radio transmission of electrical signals, with the teachings of Tarui , for the purpose of "providing a method for realize the fault containment between partitions and improve the system performance...." as stated by Tarui in lines 1-6 of column 2. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a method of coupling computers, which method comprises building computer components such as

CPUs, memories and the like in a holder made of polyhedron cube (see Tarui; fig. 1, items 190, 170, 170a; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30),

forming radio propagation bus space consisting of a cavity in the inside of the holder, disposing a plurality of radio.electric signal interconversion elements provided with a signal identification means which face the radio propagation bus space in the holder (see Tarui; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30),

connecting the radio.electric signal interconversion elements to the computer components, opening holes communicating the radio propagation bus space on the surface of outside of the holder by means of the radio lines, matching the holes by causing a plurality of the holders of the same structure to be adjacent to one another (see Tarui; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30; see Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67),

allowing the radio propagation bus spaces in the plurality of the holders to mutually communicate through the matched holes, and coupling the computer components in each holder by means of the radio by causing a plurality of the holders to be adjacent to one another (see Tarui; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30; see Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67).

The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 2** is rejected.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a coupled type computers according to claim 1, wherein the computer components are disposed in the proximity of the radio propagation bus space, and a medium for cooling is caused to

Art Unit: 2143

flow to the radio propagation bus space and the radio lines (see Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67).

The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 3** is rejected.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a method of coupling computers according to claim 2, wherein the computer components are disposed in the proximity of the radio propagation bus space, and a medium for cooling is caused to flow to the radio propagation bus space and the radio lines, whereby the computer components are cooled [see Koenck; column 34, lines 1-67].

The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 4** is rejected.

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a coupled type computers according to claim 1, wherein the radio for power source energy is emitted to the radio propagation bus space, and the power source energy is supplied to the computer components (see Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67).

The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 5** is rejected.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a method of coupling computers according to claim 2, wherein the radio for power source energy is emitted to the radio propagation bus space, and the power source energy is supplied to the computer components see [Koenck; column 34, lines 43-67].

Art Unit: 2143

The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 6** is rejected.

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a coupled computers according to claim 1, wherein the holder is formed in a cubic shape, and holes are bored in the center of each surface to allow a communication between the radio lines and the holes [see Tarui; fig. 1, items 190, 170, 170a; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30]. The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 7** is rejected.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Tarui-Koenck teaches a method of coupling computers according to claim 2, wherein the holder is formed in cubic shape, and holes are bored in the center of each surface to allow a communication between the radio lines and the holes [see Tarui; fig. 1, items 190, 170, 170a; column 4, lines 34-67; column 5, lines 1-30]. The same motivation that was used for claim 1 is also valid for this claim [see Tarui, column 2, lines 1-6]. By this rationale, **claim 8** is rejected.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jude Jean-Gilles


Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG



September 20, 2005



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100